

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. 2000-0619

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is anticipated or obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. DRAWINGS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because various figure numbers are missing. In response, the Applicants have amended the Specification to include all figure numbers depicted in the drawings. Applicants also respectfully submit that certain items in Figures 5-9 are referred to by name as allowed by 37 CFR 1.84(p)(1). (See 37 CFR 1.84(p)(1), stating "numerals are preferred".) As such, the Applicants submit that the drawings are compliant with 37 CFR 1.84 and respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2 AND 5-7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 5-7 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Colby, et al. (US Patent 6,006,264, issued December 21, 1999, herein referred to as "Colby").

Responsive to the Examiner, Applicants have canceled claims 1, 2 and 5-7 without prejudice. The rejection is now moot. However, Applicants reserve the rights to file one or more continuation applications to continue prosecution of these canceled claims.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Colby in view of Schmeidler et al. (US 6,374,402, issued April 16, 2002, herein referred to as "Schmeidler.")

Responsive to the Examiner, Applicants have canceled claim 4 without prejudice. The rejection is now moot. However, Applicants reserve the rights to file one or more continuation applications to continue prosecution of this canceled claim.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 2000-0619

IV. ALLOWED SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner has objected to claims 3, 8 and 9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Responsive to the Examiner, Applicants have amended these claims into allowable form as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and § 103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

1/28/05



Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702